

things that we can use to help cure disease. They live. It seems to me that it is the pro-life position. Using research to improve people's lives is a true pro-life position.

Once again, the President has staked out an extreme ideological position—a position that flies in the face of science and common sense. He refuses to listen to any other point of view, including the pleas of Nancy Reagan, Republican supporters of the bill, scientists all over America, and people at NIH.

I was told that some Republican supporters of this bill requested an opportunity to talk with the President, and they were turned down. He didn't even want to talk to them.

As I have said, President Bush's veto is cruel, hypocritical, and absolutely disdainful of science. But I guess most of all, it is just sad. It is just sad.

On Monday and Tuesday, we had a great debate. On Tuesday we had a great bipartisan vote, 63 Senators, Republicans, Democrats, liberals, conservatives, pro-life, pro-choice, all came together to support life-saving research. That was also supported by more than 70 percent of Americans. It was a huge debate for millions of Americans suffering from disease and paralysis who might be cured by this life-saving research.

After the vote, I went upstairs. There was a young woman in a wheelchair. She must have been upstairs watching the vote. I didn't ask her name. She was using a wheelchair, and she said, "Thank you—thank you for giving me hope."

Today, the President slammed the door. He took that hope away. How sad. How sad.

The President insists that he knows better than the American people; he knows better than all of the scientists;

he knows better than all the directors at the National Institutes of Health; he knows better than 63 Senators; he knows better than the majority of the House.

So with one arrogant stroke of his pen, he dashed the bill, dashed the hopes of millions of Americans. He vetoed the hopes. It wasn't just a veto of the bill. He vetoed the hopes of millions of Americans living with Parkinson's, ALS, juvenile diabetes, and spinal cord injuries.

Where is the President's compassion? How dare the President refer to himself as a compassionate conservative.

I don't think you can get much more conservative than Senator ORRIN HATCH, Senator SMITH, Senator LOTT, and a number of Senators here. I named them because they are cosponsors of the bill. You don't get much more conservative than that. Can you get much more conservative than Nancy Reagan? I don't think so. They were compassionate. They were truly compassionate.

My message to my nephew Kelly who waited 27 years, my message to millions of others whose hopes were raised this week and then sadly crushed today, my message is this: The President's veto is not the final word. It may be this year because to get the agreement to bring up the bill we had to agree that we wouldn't bring it up again this year. So it is over for this year. Perhaps next year, when Senator SPECTER and I will reintroduce this bill along with others in January, we will have more Senators here. We will have more Senators who represent the true wishes of the American people, who understand the necessity for moving ahead on stem cell research.

Maybe the voters this fall will speak about that. All those families who have

someone with Parkinson's, Alzheimer's or juvenile diabetes, maybe they will say, Look, we need people in the Senate and in the House who will help us get over this veto.

The President's veto is not the final word. Science is on our side. Ethics is on our side. There is an election in November. It will be known where every candidate, where he or she stands on embryonic stem cell research. We will introduce it again in January. We will be back. We will not go away. And just perhaps we will have a few more Senators and a few more Members of the House who want to do the ethical, right thing, and help cure disease and suffering with the potential of embryonic stem cell research.

It is a sad day, a sad day, indeed. We will be back.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the majority leader or his designee introduces a bill related to energy during Thursday's session, it be in order to move to proceed to that legislation on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 20, 2006.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 20, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.